

Docket No. F-7129

Ser. No. 09/914,874

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain in this application. Claims 1-15 are rejected. Claims 4 and 15 are objected to. Claim 16 is cancelled herein. Claims 5-13 and 15 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to express the invention in alternative wording, to broaden language as deemed appropriate, and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

In the Office Action of September 28, 2004, the Examiner had inquired where the membrane recited in Claim 1 is located. Applicant would like to clarify that the membrane recited in Claim 1 is located at the "contact" location between the channel and the passage openings, specifically on the substrate wafer having the passage openings.

Applicant would like to reiterate that any rejections involving Jun Yiang, Pen-Cheng Wang, Laurie E. Locascio, and Cheng S. Lee, Integrated Plastic Microfluidic Devices with ESI-MS for Drug Screening and Residue Analysis, Analytical Chemistry, Vol. 73, No. 9, May 1, 2001, pp. 2048-2053 (Jiang) and/or U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 20020058332 A1 (Quake) are improper in light of the fact that Jiang and Quake postdate the priority date of March 5, 1999. Because this is a national stage application of a PCT application, the Examiner is assumed to already have a copy of the certified priority document.

Docket No. F-7129

Ser. No. 09/914,874

The translation of the priority document and a verification of its translation will be submitted in due course. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw any rejections involving Jiang and/or Quake.


Claims 2 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,120,511 (Luft) or Jiang in view of Saaski. The December 28, 2005 Amendment differentiated Luft from the application at issue and also mentioned that Jiang postdates the priority of the application at issue. Regarding Saaski, in addition to the arguments from the December 28, 2005 Amendment, Applicant would like to point out that Saaski primarily deals with devices for conducting liquids while the current application deals with solid-phase synthesis. Accordingly, there would be no motivation to combine Saaski with Luft or Jiang in order to arrive at the current invention because Saaski and the current invention are so different. In fact, this argument is buttressed by the fact that Saaski and EP 1,165,227, which is in the same family as the current application, have different international classifications.

Docket No. F-7129

Ser. No. 09/914,874

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By 
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340